

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 12 are amended.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Mancho in the February 27, 2008 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to the phrase "when anti-skid control for," claims 1 and 12 have been amended in order to clarify that it is the controller that is configured to execute an anti-skid control as suggested by the Examiner during the telephone interview. The phrase "for terminating the braking force distribution control" has been removed from claim 12, thus rendering this ground for rejection moot.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Watanabe, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0185913. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for a controller that is configured to execute a braking force distribution control, wherein braking force on the front wheels during execution of the braking force distribution control is increased, where a braking force increment on the front wheel is determined based upon an increment of the braking action by the driver detected by the detector; however, when execution of the anti-skid control for either of the front wheels is started during the braking force distribution control, the braking force increment on the front wheels is decreased during the braking force distribution control. Claim 12 calls for similar features.

Watanabe fails to provide any disclosure with regard to executing or starting an anti-skid control during the braking force distribution control. Watanabe determines if an anti-skid control is being performed in order to determine if a braking force distribution control is

allowed (paragraph [0075]). As illustrated by steps S33, S34 and S38 of Fig. 4, a braking force distribution control is not allowed if an anti-skid control is being performed.

Watanabe thus fails to disclose executing an anti-skid control for either of the front wheels during the braking force distribution control as called for by claims 1 and 12. Because Watanabe fails to disclose this feature, Watanabe fails to achieve the advantages as discussed in Applicants' specification. In particular, as discussed on page 22, line 7-page 23, line 13 of Applicants specification, an anti-skid control for either of the front wheels is executed during the braking force distribution control because if the braking force distribution control is abruptly cancelled, a disturbance of the vehicle attitude would be created.

During the telephone interview, Examiner Mancho asserted that if an anti-skid control was performed for both of the left front wheel and the right front wheel at the same time, then the answer would be "NO" in both of steps S33 and S34 of Fig. 4 and a braking force distribution control would be performed at step S37. Applicants do not agree with this analysis because Watanabe fails to discuss this scenario and because Watanabe is simply determining whether the road has an uneven friction coefficient (paragraph [0077]).

However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, claims 1 and 12 have been clarified to recite that the braking force on the front wheels is decreased during the braking force distribution control when execution of the anti-skid control for either of the front wheels is started during the braking force distribution control. This feature is clearly supported by Applicants' page 22, lines 7-14, for example. Even if an anti-skid control was performed for both of the left front wheel and the right front wheel at the same time as asserted by Examiner Mancho (which Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's analysis), Watanabe still fails to disclose all of the features of claims 1 and 12 because execution of Watanabe's anti-skid control is started before (and not during) the braking force distribution control.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/khm

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: March 28, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
